

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.   | FILING DATE   | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/893,958  | 06/29/2001    | Xuelu Zou            | 024705-110          | 6091             |
| 75  | 90 02/13/2004 |                      | EXAM                | INER .           |
| E. Joseph Gess  |               |                      | BOLDEN, ELIZABETH A |                  |
| BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.<br>P.O. Box 1404 |               | ART UNIT             | PAPER NUMBER        |                  |
| Alexandria, VA 22313-1404                               |               | 1755                 |                     |                  |

DATE MAILED: 02/13/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|   | Application No.   | Applicant(s)   |  |  |  |  |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| Advisor, Action   | 09/893,958  | ZOU ET AL.   |  |  |  |  |
| Advisory Action   | Examiner  | Art Unit   |  |  |  |  |
|   | Elizabeth A. Bolden   | 1755   |  |  |  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| THE REPLY FILED 13 January 2004 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.   | oid abandonment of this applica<br>) a timely filed amendment whicl   | ation. A proper reply to an places the application in  |  |  |  |  |
| PERIOD FOR RE   | EPLY [check either a) or b)]  |  |  |  |  |  |
| a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offic timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR | Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin is FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF The date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply ce later than three months after the main | g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension ont of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or |  |  |  |  |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on 13 January 2004. A 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be   | ecause:   |  |  |  |  |  |
| (a)  they raise new issues that would require further   | er consideration and/or search (  | see NOTE below);   |  |  |  |  |
| (b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b  | pelow);   |  |  |  |  |  |
| (c)  they are not deemed to place the application is<br>issues for appeal; and/or   | n better form for appeal by mate  | rially reducing or simplifying the   |  |  |  |  |
| (d)  they present additional claims without canceli   | ng a corresponding number of f  | inally rejected claims.  |  |  |  |  |
| NOTE:   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject  | tion(s): See Continuation Sheet.  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) <u>1-3,11,12,17-</u> submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment c  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5.☐ The a)☐ affidavit, b)☐ exhibit, or c)☐ request for application in condition for allowance because:  |   | dered but does NOT place the   |  |  |  |  |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bec raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.   | ause it is not directed SOLELY t  | to issues which were newly   |  |  |  |  |
| 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) allowed: <u>1-3,11,12,17-19,59-63,70-94,101,105,106 and 108-110</u> .  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) objected to:   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>111-116</u> .   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 102-104 ar   | nd 107.   |  |  |  |  |  |

RARL GROUP
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1757

10. ☑ Other: See Continuation Sheet

8. The drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.

9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s).

Continuation of 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): The rejection over Ishibashi et al. with respect to claims 1-3, 11, 12, 17-19, 59-63, 70-94, 101, 105, 106, and 108-110 has been overcome by the amendement further limiting the glass composition to not include GeO2.

Continuation of 10. Other: Newly added claims 111-116 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) in view of Ishibashi et al. Currently canceled claims 95-100 were rewritten in independent form as claims 111-116. See Applicants' remarks on page 16. Claims 95-100 had been previously rejected over Ishibashi et al. As such the rejection of newly added claims 111-116 is maintained over the previous rejection.